How Ribicoff Defied the Drug Lobby P. 3

In Weakly Resuming Nuclear Tests, Kennedy Lets the Russians Off the Hook, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 35 SEPTEMBER 25, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Answering *Life* Magazine's, "97 Out of 100 People Can Be Saved"

Almost As Safe As Ivory Soap Is Pure?

Crisis is piling on crisis, instabilities mount in an unstable world, frustration is added to frustration. At such a time it is dangerous to spread the illusion that thermonuclear war may be a way out, a cleansing thunder storm in the planet's humid summer, or a cathartic that would magically purge our ills, if only we are ready to spend a cramped week or two in underground shelters, emerging on a world from which communism had happily disappeared but where free enterprise was all set to go again.* As if orchestrated out of Washington, mass circulation media are beginning to condition the public mind for nuclear war. The *Saturday Evening Post* (Sept. 16) inaugurates a new department, "The Voice of Dissent" with a piece by that favorite iconoclast of the Air Force, Herman Kahn. The Associated Press sends out a series of interviews with Dr. Edward Teller, on how exaggerated are fears of thermonuclear war. *U.S. News & World Report* (Sept. 25) runs a cheerful cover piece, "If Bombs Do Fall", with a side story from Japan on how well the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki are doing. *Life Magazine* (Sept. 15) puts a civilian in a reddish fallout suit looking like a partially boiled lobster on its cover, with the glad tidings, "How You Can Survive Fallout. 97 Out of 100 People Can Be Saved. . . ."

Why Bother With Aspirin?

No doubt the purpose is to make our threat of going to war over Berlin credible to Khrushchev, as indeed it should. Our ultimate weapon, Madison Avenue, may be able to sell anything to the American people, even the notion—why fool around with aspirin?—that one little bullet through the head and that headache will disappear. Some years back, the Pentagon and popular magazines were advertising how many Russian cities we could "take out" if necessary. Now the same moral imbecility is being applied to our own cities. "About five million people," *Life* says lightly, "less than 3% of the population, would die." It adds hastily, to anticipate any vestigial humane twinges, "This in itself is a ghastly number. But you have to look at it coldly. . . ." *Life* has been telling us righteously that the Godless Chinese Reds put little value on human life. Mao is willing to see millions die to wipe out capitalism but Henry Luce is willing to see millions die to wipe out communism. Kennedy, like Khrushchev, prepares the public mind to gamble all, if necessary, on Berlin. This is the real mobilization. Our moral scruples and our good sense must first be conscripted.

Worse than the horror is the levity, the transparent mendacity and the eager commercialism. A happy family with three children is shown by *Life* in their well stocked assemble-it-yourself prefabricated steel shelter, only $700 from the Kelsey-Hayes Company (and soon to be marketed by Sears, Roebuck). A picture shows a girl laughingly talking on the phone from an underground shelter, as if to her beau, who is presumably in his own shelter and ready to take her to the latest movie as soon as the all clear sounds. Grandmother's old fashioned remedies turn out to be best after all even in thermonuclear war. "The best first aid for radiation sickness," *Life* advises, "is to take hot tea or a solution of baking soda." Suddenly thermonuclear war is made to seem familiar, almost cozy. All you need is a shelter, a well stocked pantry, some new gadgets like geiger counters. The budding boom in these products promises to stimulate badly lagging magazine lineage. *Life's* editorial hopes Khrushchev notices "our spontaneous boom in shelter-building" and concludes euphorically, "He

(*Continued on Page Four*)

Russell's Latest Appeal

"At any moment of any day the slightest miscalculation can bring nuclear war. Rockets are poised at a few minutes' notice. H-bombers are continually in the air, radar is totally unreliable. Radioactivity kills and maims our children. War is always imminent.

"To use the vast scheme of mass murder which is being prepared, nominally for our protection, but in fact for universal extermination, is a horror and an abomination. We call upon people everywhere to rise against this monstrous tyranny.

"We call upon scientists to refuse work on nuclear weapons. We call upon workers to 'black' [boycott] all work connected with them and to use their industrial strength in the struggle for life. We will not tolerate the incineration of human beings because governments are occupied with idiotic matters of prestige."

—Bertrand Russell, appeal for "an international resistance movement" to nuclear war, issued from prison Sept. 17 "when 3,000 police struggled to clear a crowd of 15,000" out of Trafalgar Square "in the biggest ban-the-bomb demonstration held in London" and a "pirate" voice of nuclear disarmament broke in on BBC television. This account and the Russell text is from the London Daily Telegraph, *Sept. 18.*

*** "What about money? Instead of destroying all old bills that are taken out of circulation, the Government is storing money away in strongboxes around the country. Enough $1 bills have been saved to last 8 months. . . .**

"Bank accounts safe? Plans are being worked out to enable you to write checks on your bank account—even if the bank itself were destroyed."

—"If Bombs Do Fall on U.S."—U.S. News and World Report, Sept. 25.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Humphrey Warns: We'd Better Take the Initiative Now Toward A New Agreement

In Weakly Resuming Tests, Kennedy Helps Russian Propaganda

One day last week President Kennedy was so worried about U.S. ineffectiveness abroad in psychological and political warfare that he set up a Cabinet level group to study the problem for him. The next day he resumed testing. The President is concerned, as many of us are, by the capacity of the Russians to "get away with it" as they did on test resumption with a minimum of world protest. But he makes the Russian task easier by weakly following their lead. The best information I can get is that the reasons for resumption were political. As he did on Cuba, Mr. Kennedy decided to split the difference between appeasing the rightists and following a clear moral line. The result is apt to be the same. In Cuba, we got the benefit neither of a forceful nor of a conciliatory policy. On testing, we neither terrorize as the Russians do by talking of a new monster weapon nor win a propaganda victory by setting a sharp contrast between their policy and ours.

Why Didn't They (and We) Wait?

Two questions remain unanswered in the resumption of testing. One is why the Russians didn't wait, since it seemed fairly clear that if they didn't start testing soon, we would. The other is why Kennedy acted so precipitantly. At first it was said we feared that the Russians after a short series of tests would put us on the spot by calling for a new moratorium. Now the AP quotes unnamed scientists *(Washington Post,* Sept. 19) as fearing that the Russian tests will go on until the atmosphere is saturated with radioactive debris "but just short of an unquestionable health-hazard point." Thus, so goes this new theory, the Russians will prevent us from engaging in atmospheric tests, too, "lest these endanger people throughout the world." When supposedly informed opinion oscillates between such extreme theories, it is clear that we are doing some wild guessing. It would be better to base national policy on our own conceptions of what is right.

Several things have been clarified by the Soviet resumption of testing. One is that the fear of secret Soviet testing underground was a bogey created by opponents of test cessation on our side. If the Soviet Union had the means or the inclination to secret underground testing, it would not now be devoting so many of the detonations in its current series to weapons in the small kiloton range. The second is that it was equally deceptive to argue that the prolonged test talks constituted a plot by the Russians to keep us from testing. In retrospect, it looks the other way round. The moratorium tended to freeze a situation in which we were far ahead of the Russians, since we had made many more tests. The third observation is that we would have been better off with an agreement even on Russian terms, including the *troika.* No special network is required to detect violations of the treaty in the atmosphere where the Russians are testing and where we will soon be testing, too, if our military and AEC have their way.

The case against nuclear testing has in no way been changed by Soviet resumption. It pollutes the air of mankind. It steps up world tension. It speeds up a nuclear arms race that leads nowhere but mutual destruction. It is more urgent than ever to stop it. Are we going to drift along in the Russian wake, or—as Senator Humphrey pleaded in a thoughtful but unnoticed speech to the Senate Sept. 16—take the initiative toward a new agreement? Humphrey warned that the Russians may finish their tests and go before the UN General Assembly with a plan for test cessation. "Unless we take the initiative," Humphrey told the Senate, "we shall be trapped again by Soviet propaganda."

The U-2 and New Soviet Tests

"Undoubtedly a number of factors hardened the Soviet attitude on test talks at Geneva. Soviet successes elsewhere, reluctance to accept even a partial loss of sovereignty, and renewed pressure from the military all would appear to be contributory. In this connection, I have a view that our U-2 overflights may have cast their shadow over the conference table at Geneva. Soviet secrecy as to their strategic bases was a priceless asset and must have given the Kremlin a great sense of security. This position of security was greatly undermined by the U-2 affair. Generals in the USSR must have viewed their fixed ICBM bases as highly vulnerable to a U.S. first strike or preemptive attack. To redress this loss of security there must have arisen a strong military demand for solid-fueled, mobile, ballistic missiles of intercontinental range. A lighter weight, high-yield missile warhead would then become a military requirement of high urgency. This, in turn, would generate high pressure for the resumption of Soviet tests capable of developing these new warheads."

—Ralph Lapp, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Sept.

Opponent of Test Cessation and Advocate of Neutron Bomb Changes His Mind

"I have been asked by the editor to make some remarks concerning the so-called 'neutron bomb.' . . . I am unfortunately not permitted by security regulations to state my views upon these questions with any precision. I therefore confine myself to general statements. . . .

"First, I do not believe that neutron bombs are militarily advantageous to the U.S. nor that they will alleviate any of our military problems. On the contrary, neutron bombs, like hydrogen bombs, will in the long run only complicate our lives, increase our insecurity and possibly facilitate our extermination. Second, I do not support any of the arguments which have recently appeared in the newspapers claiming that the neutron bomb makes it necessary to resume testing immediately. . . .

"In the long run I do not see any way to halt the merciless advance of nuclear technology, except by complete openness in nuclear research. The objective of openness is of such overriding importance, that it is worth almost any risk to reach it. For this reason, when Khrushchev offered us complete openness in exchange for complete disarmament, we ought to have jumped at the offer. Despite all the uncertainties . . . this is the kind of a bargain that would in the long run make sense."

—Prof. Freeman J. Dyson, Institute for Advanced Study, in the September 1961 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists (writing before Soviet test resumption); 18 months ago in Foreign Affairs (April 1960) Prof. Dyson argued against test cessation and for work on the neutron bomb.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Documentary: Ribicoff Vigorous Against Medical Abuses in Testifying for Kefauver Bill

"We Give Hogs More Protection Than People Against Worthless Drugs"

Not since the days of Harold Ickes has a Cabinet officer spoken out with the vigor shown by Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Ribicoff in challenging the drug lobby by his testimony Sept. 13 in support of Senator Kefauver's bill S. 1552 to protect the public from overpriced drugs and misleading claims for them. Press coverage was poor and we provide excerpts here:

"The first and most basic proposal is to require that a 'new drug' be proved effective before it may be marketed for general use in interstate commerce.

"Mr. Chairman, I am firmly of the opinion that the time has come in the United States—in 1961—to give American men, women and children the same protection we have been giving hogs, sheep and cattle since 1913. For the plain fact is that until we are allowed to require that a drug be proven effective before it is marketed, we must say to the American people: a hog is protected against worthless drugs, but you are not.

No Similar Authority for Humans

"The Virus-Serum-Toxin Act of 1913 forbids 'worthless' biologicals for the treatment of domestic animals and provides for establishment and product licenses to assure compliance at the sources. No similar authority exists with respect to drugs for human consumption.

"There has been a great deal of misunderstanding over this requirement of proven effectiveness. The proposal is really quite simple. Under present law, the Food and Drug Administration requires proof only of safety before allowing a new drug to be marketed. Even if the FDA has reason to believe that the new drug is not effective for the purposes claimed, it must approve the new drug application. . . .

"For example, when a drug is presented to us for clearance under the new drug procedures with labelling offering it for weight reduction, for the treatment of symptoms of arthritis and rheumatism, or for other conditions, but it is substantially innocuous, we cannot deny the new drug application on the ground that the article is unsafe. We have to approve it, although we believe that the promotion of the drug will actually violate the provisions of the law against false and misleading labelling.

"We believe this state of affairs is indefensible. We believe that where public health is involved, it is intolerable to permit the marketing of worthless products under the rules of a cat-and-mouse game where a manufacturer can fool the public until the Food and Drug Administration finally catches up with him. . . .

"Let me make it absolutely clear that we are not dealing here with what some have called 'relative efficacy.' The claim has been made before this subcommittee that the proposed amendment would enable us 'to decide the relative or comparative efficacy of a new drug in terms of drugs already on the market. . . .'

"The proposed amendments would merely require a showing that the new drug described in the application is safe for use and is effective in use, under conditions prescribed, recommended or suggested in the labelling thereof. This would not require a showing of relatively greater efficacy. . . . It would merely require that a drug claimed to be effective for a particular purpose has been demonstrated by sound scientific procedures to be effective for that purpose. In short, it must live up to the claims made for it."

Inspections Now Few and Feeble

"A food and drug inspector gets into each of the 1200 drug factories once every 4.6 years on the average. . . . He observes manufacturing operations that may be underway at the moment. . . . But these and other steps authorized by present law fall far short of allowing him to make a true evaluation. . . .

"Most drug plants produce only a few of their products at any one time. The inspector generally cannot determine . . . the processes . . . employed in his absence. . . . Most of the firms we inspect voluntarily permit such inspections today. However, in the 32 months ending August 1961, 122 firms refused to permit one or more phases of inspection. . . . This hide-and-seek method of attempting to inspect questionable drug plants is an absurdity. . . . The factory inspection provisions of S. 1552 would correct this situation with respect to drugs for prescription use."

—Ribicoff testifying for S. 1552, Sept. 13.

An Example of False Advertising in AMA Journal At Expense of Heart Patients

"With more than 400 new drugs coming onto the market each year, is it realistic to suppose that every practicing physician can make an accurate determination of the effectiveness of each of these products? If there is any doubt about this, let me cite one example of the kind of unsupported claims that are currently being made to the medical profession and relied upon by physicians in prescribing drugs.

"The January 14, 1961, issue of the American Medical Association Journal contained an advertisement for a product called 'Clarin', which is heparin potassium in a tablet to be taken under the tongue. The advertisement states that the drug has 'demonstrated value' in 'post-coronary management,' and that in a significant number of cases it has prevented recurrent heart attacks. Yet in the 1961 edition of New and Non-Official Drugs, a publication of the AMA's own Council on Drugs, the same drug is given the following appraisal: 'However, there is as yet no convincing objective evidence that heparin, given sublingually, either prevents or ameliorates any manifestation of cardiovascular disease. Hence, the use of heparin potassium in the hope of ameliorating the progress of atherosclerosis must be considered experimental.'

"The drug is being prescribed for these unproved conditions. While we cannot estimate its total sales, they exceed $300,000 annually. Local prices are about $8.50 a bottle of 50 tablets. If 3 each day were the dose, the patient would be out over $15 a month for an ineffective drug. The burden of this cost falls heavily on a post heart attack victim—generally one least able to bear protracted costs of maintenance medication. Physicians prescribing the drug in reliance on claims such as are made in the advertisements are unwittingly experimenting with their heart patients, at the patients' expense."

—Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Ribicoff before the Kefauver subcommittee on S. 1552, Sept. 13.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kennedy Told Congressional Leaders War Would Cost 70 Million U. S. Lives

(*Continued from Page One*)

cannot doubt our ability to wage nuclear war, or to erase his cities." Aren't we getting our people ready to accept the erasure of ours? We used to think thermonuclear war likely only if lunatics came to power. Well, here they are.

No Time to Pile Delusion on Hysteria

I am not arguing for surrender, a runout on Berlin, dishonor, national cowardice, appeasement or better-red-than-dead. I am trying to say that when a nation faces problems as complex as those which now face ours in Germany, the United Nations, the Congo, Laos and the resumption of nuclear testing, there is a duty on every publisher and every writer to help inculcate sobriety and the need for reflection. The President's power to maneuver and negotiate is not helped by piling delusion upon hysteria, by making people feel not only that we face a simple choice of death-or-surrender but that most of us won't die anyway—so why bother to negotiate?

Why should President Kennedy lend his name to *Life's* wicked stunt? Nowhere does *Life* tell us what level and kind of attack it assumes which need kill only 3 percent of our people. The latest Rand study in the new Holifield committee hearings shows 3 percent dead as the result of "a very small attack delivering 300 megatons" on military targets exclusively. Even this small attack, if aimed at our cities would put inescapable deaths (with everyone in some shelter) up to 35 percent. The same study (p. 216, House Gov't Operations, Civil Defense, Aug. 1961) shows a 3,000 megaton attack on cities would put inescapable deaths up to 80 percent. The new Holifield report on these hearings says that an attack half this size, as assumed by Secretary McNamara, would kill 50 million Americans and seriously injury 20 million more (see section on "Loose Arithmetic" p. 55). The report warns that the existing basement space on which the Secretary relies to save 10 to 15 million lives won't do. "All deaths from fallout can be prevented," the report says, "but not in existing buildings, even when improved. Nationwide, the largest number of structures do not afford even the bare minimum factor considered necessary to bring the radiation hazard down to tolerable levels."

Stewart Alsop's "Report Card" on Kennedy in the *Saturday Evening Post* Sept. 16 disclosed that the President told Congressional leaders a new war would cost 70,000,000 dead Americans. Even Dr. Teller did not go beyond saying that 90 percent of our population could be saved. Where did *Life* get that 97%? Was it a copywriter's bright flash? Just as Ivory Soap is sold as 99 percent pure, is thermonuclear war to be sold as 97 percent safe?

Death In A Den of Wolves

Dag Hammarskjold's career was set for an unhappy ending. Gospel to the contrary, the peacemaker's lot is an accursed one. He was ringed by a strange coalition of enemies: the Soviet Union, the great copper mining interests of Katanga and Northern Rhodesia with all the influence they command in Brussels, London and New York; de Gaulle and the French African Catholic bloc which radiates out of Brazzaville and has been helping Tshombe. Senator Dodd was attacking Hammarskjold's peace efforts in the Congo a few days before his death as a Communist plot while Moscow was assailing him as an imperialist tool, and Peking was angrily withdrawing its envoy from Stanleyville because Gizenga (to our simple-minded rightists a Red) had joined the central government! Britain's Tories backed by Rhodesia's white supremacists were opening an attack on Hammarskjold before he died, and an evil role was played in his death by the refusal of the British government (until after he died) to allow the Ethiopians to fly three jet planes over East African territory to guard UN forces from Tshombe's two jets. More attention should be focused on this. It was lack of air cover which forced his fatal night flight. First Lumumba, now Hammarskjold, are the victims of neo-colonialism in the Congo. The United Nations and world peace may be next, particularly if Moscow persists in its obdurate Peking-style attitude toward the UN. Mr. Hammarskjold had to operate in a den of wolves, and died in the struggle for world law.

We'll Send Free Sample Copies of This to Friends If You Send Stamped Self-Addressed LONG Envelopes

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

9/25/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last Monday in August and the first in September and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED